MINUTES OF MEETING OF COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN WASHINGTON, D. C., DECEMBER 14, 1923.

The third meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts during the fiscal year 1924 was held in its office in the Interior Department Building, on Friday, December 14, 1923. The following members were present:

Mr. Moore, Chairman,
Mr. Greenleaf,
Mr. Fraser,
Mr. Ayres,
Mr. Bacon,
Mr. Mowbray,
Mr. Medary,
also Mr. H. P. Caemmerer, Secretary and Executive Officer.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETING: The minutes of the meeting held November 15 and 16, 1923, were approved.

2. CONVENTION OF ART COMMISSIONS IN BOSTON: The secretary reported that he received a communication dated December 10, 1923, from Mr. Andrew Wright Crawford, secretary of the Art Jury of Philadelphia, stating "I presume that you received a telegram saying that the meeting today in Boston was called off. I am therefore returning the slides that you sent me at once".

The Convention was to have been held on December 10th, and Mr. Crawford had been asked to give an illustrated lecture on progress of the work of different Art Commissions during the past two years.

3. STANDARDIZATION OF UNITED STATES FLAG: Under date of November 27, 1923, the Commission received the following communication from the Department

of Commerce with regard to the United States flag:

> "At the conference held here November 20th to consider the standardization of proportions and sizes of the United States flag, the recommendations of the Commission as covered in your letter of May 12th were very favorably regarded, and the Committee appointed to advise on a course of action recommended the universal adoption of these proportions. We are now canvassing various organizations for their acceptance of this recommendation and hope to be able to present to you in due time a summary statement showing a very wide acceptance of your proposals.
>
> "In the meantime, however, the question has arisen as to the proper diameter of the circle enclosing the stars, and we respectfully request that the Commission advise us on this point. In other words, what should be the correct proportions of star circle diameter to use with the 1.67 to 1 proportion of fly to hoist with the fly 3/4 of the hoist of the flag. Can this star circle diameter be expressed as a definite proportion of the width of stripe? The great variation in the sizes of stars used on flags of the same general proportions and dimensions warrants a specific recommendation on this point."

The Commission gave careful consideration to the particular request made for advice "as to the proper diameter of the circle enclosing the stars." Mr. Mowbray stated that he thought a very good proportion would be to base the star circle on a proportion of 3/4 of the stripe; that the union worked out on this basis would leave room for additional stars, it being understood that the position of the stars is subject to continual change.

Mr. Bacon stated that before making a suggestion he thought a drawing should be made, based on the proposed proportions of the United States flag. Mr. Ayres suggested arranging the stars on a diagonal, and called attention to the fact that in the union of the flag of July 4, 1818 (page 310 of the book entitled Flags of the World, published by the National Geographic Society, in 1917), the union is square.

In the discussion it was pointed out that care would have to be taken, so that in the flag of the proposed new proportion of 1.67 to 1 the stars would not be too small, nor too large so as to affect the blue of the union;

and the conclusion was reached that for further consideration of the subject three drawings should be submitted, as follows:

1. A drawing of a "standard flag" based on the proposed new proportions;
2. A union, with the star diameter 3/4 of the width of the stripe, that could be superimposed on the union of design No.1;
3. A drawing showing the 48 stars arranged on a diagonal, using a square union.

Mr. Mowbray suggested calling the attention of the Department of Commerce to the fact that it is only since 48 stars have appeared on the flag that the geometric pattern has been adopted. Mr. Mowbray said he has a flag of 46 stars in which the arrangement of the stars is much different and much handsomer.

The Department of Commerce was requested to furnish the drawings. (Exhibit A).

4. INTERNATIONAL ART EXHIBITION IN VENICE: Mr. Moore advised that he had received the following letter, dated December 13, 1923, from the National Academy of Design, 109th Street and Amsterdam Avenue, New York City, of which Mr. Blashfield is President, promising cooperation in the matter of the exhibition:

> "Through Mr. Blashfield, the subject of the representation of the United States at the International Art Exhibition at Venice was presented before the Council of the National Academy of Design at its last meeting and the Council, at that time, expressed its sentiment in the following Resolution:
>
> RESOLVED: That the Council of the National Academy of Design of New York sympathizes wholeheartedly with any efforts to raise money for a pavilion at the International Art Exhibition at Venice for the display of American Art."

The Commission recommended that the letter be transmitted to the Department of State for their information (Exhibit B).

5. DOMINICAN CAMPAIGN MEDAL: By letter dated December 11, 1923, the

Secretary of the Navy advised that "The Department is well pleased with the result of Mr. Weinman's efforts and has approved the photograph of the model, conditional,however, upon the removal from the face of the medal of the initials of the sculptor".

Mr. Fraser stated that on the coins in Europe the initials of the designer are always used, even names; that Mr. Weinman's initials appear on the new 50¢ and 10¢ pieces, and that it has been the practice of the Treasury Department generally to place the initials of the designer on the coins. Mr. Bacon said that all the French medals have the initials of the designer,- that they add interest to the medal.

The Commission recommended that the initials of Mr. Weinman be retained on the Dominican Campaign Medal, and the Navy Department was advised accordingly (Exhibit C).

6. HENRY B. F. MACFARLAND MEMORIAL: The Macfarland Memorial Committee resubmitted plans for their proposed memorial fountain, with the statement---

> "According to this second set, the drinking fountain would face west, that is towards the present large fountain, which would be left untouched by our plan, with the idea that at some future time Congress might appropriate a sum sufficient to make it an attractive fountain. Such a fountain, being placed by ours, would thus make a very attractive little park out of the triangle. This second design of Mr. Bush-Brown calls for a little walk between our fountain and the rest of the triangle, and the present trees would be left where they are".

The Commission adhered to their former decision that no drinking fountain should be placed on this triangle, and stated that the triangle is not large enough for two fountains. The Commission suggested, that if the Macfarland Memorial Committee thought it preferable, the medallion of Mr. Macfarland might be placed on Peck Chapel (Exhibit D).

7. STATUE OF THOMAS JEFFERSON: Under date of December 13, 1923, the

Commission received the following letter from Mrs. Minnigerode Andrews, President of The National Monticello Association, Washington, D.C., as follows:

> "As president of The National Monticello Association, and interested in all that honors the name and recognizes the service of Thomas Jefferson to his country, I ask, at the earliest moment, to submit a design for your approval, a statue of Thomas Jefferson by my friend Henry K. Bush-Brown.
>
> "Further I would respectfully request an assignment of a position on the south steps of the State Department, corresponding to the location of the Alexander Hamilton south of the Treasury.
>
> "On the occasion of the unveiling of the Hamilton statue, President Harding in his admirable address, observed (and he was widely quoted) that under the present conditions, when order and law were threatened throughout the world, no nation could hope to endure, that was not founded on civic and religious freedom. I never heard him more impressive, and I could but think it was to Thomas Jefferson very largely that our country owes its present standards of civic and religious freedom.
>
> "As yet there is no adequate recognition of this influence; we are trying, and succeeding, by individual effort, to create one suitable memorial, in the preservation of the classic buildings and historic traditions, at Monticello; but a statue in the city which owes so much to him, and placed in a position so appropriate to the honor of our first Secretary of State, would be a real gift to the American people from their government. Should this project meet with your approval, the sculptor will submit later a design for the pedestal."

The Commission advised that, as Congress had not acted in the matter, no official action could be taken with reference to the proposed statue (Exhibit E)

8. IMPROVEMENT OF LIGHTING, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA: Captain John E. Wood, Assistant to the Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia, and Mr. Joseph Gosling, submitted to the Commission further studies (A,B,C,D,E) of proposed street lights for avenues and plazas in Washington. Mr. Gosling stated that he had endeavored to design the lamp post with the double light according to the recommendations of the Commission, so that the lights appear as growing out of the pole, rather than "stuck on". To illustrate this Mr. Gosling submitted two enlarged prints; but they were not satisfactory to the Commission, the shaft being too slender.

The Commission felt that design "C" simplified and restudied with the

base of design "D" would make a better design, and Mr. Gosling was requested to make a sketch embodying these designs, which he did, and submitted it to the Commission for consideration. This revised design (marked y) the Commission felt would make an appropriate lamp post. Mr. Gosling was requested to make it the subject of further study in matters of detail and submit a drawing at the next meeting of the Commission.

As to a device for pennants for street decorations, it was thought that the pennant could be attached to the lamp fixture, making a special device on the lamp post unnecessary. The question of street signs it was thought had best be considered later when a model of the lamp post is made.

9. HOME FOR THE FEEBLE MINDED, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA: Captain John E. Wood, and Mr. A. L. Harris, Municipal Architect, resubmitted the ground plan for the proposed Home for the Feeble Minded of the District of Columbia, to be located near Camp Meade, showing changes suggested at the November meeting of the Commission. Mr. Harris called particular attention to the grouping of the buildings. The design showed the entrance to the grounds on the main road from Laurel, Md., through which the Washington-Baltimore pike passes; but the administration building had been placed at the farther end of the grounds, near the river, to be reached in a round about way by a side road. Mr. Greenleaf objected to this arrangement and said if topographic conditions permitted it would be much better and save a great deal of useless travel to have the administration building near the entrance of the grounds. The Commission concurred in this, and it was agreed that the arrangement of the buildings should be reversed, thereby placing the administration building near the main road. It was suggested that the Superintendent's residence be placed

at the corner of the grounds not far from the administration building.

Mr. Harris stated that he would make a new drawing in accordance with these recommendations.

10. HOWARD UNIVERSITY, PLANS FOR ARMORY-GYMNASIUM AND ATHLETIC FIELD: Dr. J. Stanley Durkee, President, Dr. Emmett J. Scott, Secretary-Treasurer, of Howard University, and Mr. A. I. Cassell, architect, appeared before the Commission with plans for the proposed Armory-Gymnasium and Athletic Field. Dr. Scott said in preparing the plans every effort had been made to carry out the recommendations of the Commission of Fine Arts contained in the letter addressed to Howard University on June 12, 1923 (Exhibit F). Dr. Scott said these plans had been drawn with a view to securing the proposed improvements within the $197,500 authorized by Congress. Two ground plans were submitted showing proposed locations of the building, one showing the building on a diagonal to the Athletic Field, to which arrangement the Commission objected. The other plan showed the building at the head of the Athletic Field, which the Commission said was the proper place for it, even though, as Dr. Scott explained, it would necessitate relocating another proposed building to be known as "Clark Hall", and the closing of a street. The Commission recommended that if this could not be done the building might be placed on a section of public land, alongside the Athletic Field. Mr. Cassell explained the building plans. Mr. Medary questioned him as to details of the plans and ascertained that they contemplated a building with a capacity of 700,000 cubic feet, which would make the cost of the building far exceed the amount authorized.

The plans were kept by Dr. Durkee for further study and inquiry as to the possibility of placing the proposed building at the head of the Athletic

Field, or on the section of public land adjacent to it, as recommended by the Commission.

11. VIRGINIA AVENUE EXTENSION: Mr. John Small, Jr., Landscape Architect, submitted a drawing of a proposed extension of Virginia Avenue from 30th and K Streets to the Francis Scott Key Bridge. The plan had been prepared for Mr. Frank Lyon, a resident of Arlington County, Virginia, and contemplated carrying out a suggestion of Hon. R. Walton Moore, of Virginia, who had introduced a bill in the 67th Congress for the extension of Virginia Avenue, to improve traffic conditions at the District of Columbia side of the Key Bridge.

Information had been received from Mr. Lyon that he had taken up the matter with Major Bell, Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia, who had suggested in preference to the extension of Virginia Avenue, said to involve an expenditure of $1,400,000, the widening of M Street from 50 to 60 feet, by reducing the width of the sidewalks.

Mr. Moore said he had talked the matter over with Representative Moore, and that he was not insistent on the extension of Virginia Avenue if the approach to the Key Bridge could be improved in some other way.

The Commission were of the opinion that it would be better to extend Pennsylvania Avenue from the point where it stops abruptly, without apparent reason, at about 29th and M Streets, to take up M Street through Georgetown to the Key Bridge, and then widen M Street on the west side, as it slopes towards the Potomac. The Commission did not believe that reducing the width of the sidewalks a few feet will be a satisfactory solution of the difficulty, whereas widening M Street on the west side as it passes through Georgetown, will give to Pennsylvania Avenue a splendid vista, furnish the

improved traffic conditions which are needed there, and will be in keeping with a later development, which the Commission felt ought to take place at a not distant date, namely to improve the water front from the Lincoln Memorial to the Francis Scott Key Bridge.

12. HARDING MEMORIAL ASSOCIATION: Mr. Moore reported that Brigadier General Charles E. Sawyer, physician to the President, had stated that he had been made Chairman of the local committee of the Harding Memorial Association and had requested the cooperation of the Commission of Fine Arts. Mr. Moore said he had promised General Sawyer such cooperation, and the Commission concurred in the matter.

13. PHOTOGRAPH OF BUST OF PRESIDENT HARDING: Under date of November 21, 1923, the Commission received the following letter from Lieut. Col. C.O.Sherrill:

> "I am enclosing herewith a copy of some photographs of a bust of President Harding, concerning which Mr. Salvatore M. Pino, of New York, requests an expression of opinion as to its artistic value, with a view to its being presented to the Government here in Washington. Any information you may wish in reference to this will be furnished by Mr. Pino, 42 Elm Street, New York City."

The Commission did not regard the work a good piece of sculpture, nor a good likeness of the late President Harding. (Exhibit G).

14. PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROGRAM FOR WASHINGTON: Mr. Moore called attention to that part of the Message of President Coolidge to Congress, in which the President had recommended the following (Congressional Record, December 6, 1923, page 100):

Public Buildings

> Many of the departments in Washington need better housing facilities. Some are so crowded that their work is impeded, others are so scattered that they lose their identity. While I do not favor at this time a general public building law, I believe it is now necessary, in accordance with plans already sanctioned for a unified and orderly system for the development of this city, to begin the carrying out of those plans by authorizing the erection of three or four buildings most urgently needed by an annual appropriation of $5,000,000.

The Commission expressed their appreciation of this recommendation.

Mr. Moore said if this appropriation of $5,000,000 is made available work on several public buildings could be begun for which plans were made several years ago, among them being a State Department Building, an Archives Building, a building for the Department of Justice, and a Department of Commerce building. Mr. Moore said he had also talked with Representative Madden, Chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, with regard to the construction of the Mall roads from the Washington Monument to the Capitol, saying it would require only a small appropriation to put in one road, and he thought Mr. Madden would have that done this year.

The Commission felt that a public buildings program for Washington would encourage the selection of permanent sites for other public buildings that are needed.

15. FREER GALLERY OF ART PURCHASES: The Commission visited the Freer Gallery of Art and, upon the recommendation of Mr. John E. Lodge, Curator, after inspection, approved the purchase of the following articles:

7 Rajput paintings,
3 Persian miniatures,
1 Jaina manuscript with 33 paintings
accompanying the text
1 Chinese gilt bronze toilet box (lien).

16. MONUMENT TO THE UNKNOWN SOLDIER, ARLINGTON: Mr. Hastings advised that he had received authority from the War Department to erect a full size model (solar print, as the Commission had recommended), of his design for the monument to the Unknown Soldier at Arlington, and an inspection of the model was made in the afternoon with Hon. John W. Weeks, Secretary of War, who was accompanied by Mr. Elon H. Hooker (member of the Roosevelt Memorial Association), and Mr. Thomas Hastings, Architect of the Amphitheater. All the members of the Commission were present. There were also present Brigadier General John B. Bellinger, Acting Quartermaster General, Col. H. C. Bonnycastle, Quartermaster

Supply Officer, and Mr. Robert R. Dye, Superintendent of Arlington.

The model was an enlargement of the preliminary design which Mr. Hastings had prepared in December, 1921, at the request of the War Department, soon after the burial of the Unknown Soldier on Armistice Day,1921. The solar print (28 feet 1 inch in height) had been erected over the foundation or base of the monument, which is about 5 feet high.

The Commission unanimously approved the proportions and mass of the design; and a sculptural treatment at the top, as indicated by the sarcophagus, which should be simplified through study and execution by a sculptor of the first rank. The architect, Mr. Hastings, was informed of a protest which had been received by the Commission, from the National Jewish Welfare Board,against the use of a Cross on the monument, concerning which the Commission had advised that no symbol on the Monument should be of a character to offend the religious feelings of any body of citizens of the United States, and Mr. Hastings stated that the design will be modified accordingly. Mr. Hastings stated it was his intention to have Mr. Paul Bartlett, one of the leading sculptors in America, do the sculptural work on the monument. On the shaft appeared the following quotation from the Address of President Harding, at the time of the burial of the Unknown Soldier at Arlington, on Armistice Day, November 11, 1921:

"WE DO NOT KNOW THE
EMINENCE OF HIS BIRTH
BUT WE DO KNOW THE
GLORY OF HIS DEATH.
HE DIED FOR HIS
COUNTRY,
AND GREATER DEVOTION
HATH NO MAN THAN THIS.
HE DIED UNQUESTIONING
UNCOMPLAINING WITH
FAITH IN HIS HEART AND
HOPE ON HIS LIPS
THAT HIS COUNTRY
SHOULD TRIUMPH AND
ITS CIVILIZATION
SURVIVE."

The Commission felt that placing the inscription in this manner, subject to minor changes in the arrangement of the lettering, was a decided improvement over the plan which had been suggested by Col. Penrose to have no more than the present base for the Monument to the Unknown Soldier, and crowd the inscription around it.

The Secretary of War stated that the form of the model did not please him; that he thought it was giving too much honor to one soldier. Mr. Hooker called attention to the simple tomb of Cecil Rhodes, on the top of a high mountain, in South Africa.

The Commission felt, unanimously, that the Monument to the Unknown Soldier stands for far more than simply one soldier, that the monument typifies all the unknown soldiers of the World War (of which there are about 1500), who lost their lives either at sea or at the battle front, and is a tribute of the Nation to them; and in this connection the Commission called attention to the fact that France buried her Unknown Soldier under the Arch of Triumph, in Paris, the greatest triumphal arch in the world, and that Great Britain buried her Unknown Soldier in Westminster Abbey and erected an impssing cenotaph, somewhat similar, though larger than the one designed by Mr. Hastings, at Whitehall, in the crowded section of London.

The Secretary of War stated that he was simply giving his personal views as to the design, but as a public official he would recommend the appropriation of $50,000 to Congress, to provide for the monument, and in the meantime desired a report from the Commission of Fine Arts, which he wished to consider at another meeting, together with others that are to be present to consider Mr. Hastings' design.

The Commission submitted their report to the Secretary of War, together

with an explanatory statement furnished by Mr. Hastings (and a photograph of the cenotaph in London) to accompany the report. (Exhibit H).

17. ARLINGTON AMPHITHEATER MUSEUM: The Commission inspected the Musum of the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater in the afternoon, with Hon. John W. Weeks, Secretary of War, and Mr. Thomas Hastings, Architect of the Amphitheater. A general survey was made of the articles in the cases, but details as to a rearrangement were left for attention at another meeting.

18. BUCHANAN MEMORIAL: General Lawrason Riggs, of Baltimore, having advised that the full size model of the Buchanan Memorial was ready for inspection, Mr. Moore, Mr. Greenleaf, and Mr. Fraser, inspected the model in Baltimore, Saturday morning, December 15th, in company with Mr. Schuler, sculptor, Mr. Beecher, architect, of the memorial, and General Riggs. Arrangements for the inspection were made by the secretary, who was also present. The model had been erected in the United States Cemetery, which adjoins the H. P. Rieger stone yard, 3429 Frederick Avenue. The massiveness of the monument, which is to be placed on the east side of the Lower Garden of Meridian Hill Park, asserted itself, the model being 75 feet long.

Mr. Fraser made a number of suggestions to the sculptor, which will improve the monument. It was thought in particular that the seated figure of Buchanan was too low, and his head too large. The pedestal was thought weak, but Mr. Fraser preferred to have this feature considered by the architect members of the Commission, in connection with other architectural problems in the model that required attention. The sculptural figures, one at each end of the monument, were to be given somewhat more formal seats. Mr. Fraser suggested that the monument be done in granite, instead of marble, which met with the approval of Mr. Greenleaf and Mr. Moore.

Mr. Beecher raised the question as to whether or not there is too much platform in the model, in proportion to the pylons, and whereby the planting is cut off by the width of the steps at the sides. Mr. Greenleaf suggested modifications which will relate the architecture more closely to the planting. It was felt very desirable by all present that the architect members of the Commission see the model, and General Riggs stated he would be pleased to be present with the sculptor and the architect of the monument whenever the architect members of the Commission would find it possible to come.

C O P Y

December 18, 1923

Dear Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting December 14, 1923, gave consideration to your letter of November 27th, stating that at your recent conference the recommendations of this Commission contained in a letter of May 12, 1923, with reference to a change in the proportions of the United States flag, were very favorably regarded, and asking to be advised "as to the proper diameter of the circle enclosing the stars."

It seemed to the Commission that the simplest form to calculate the diameter of the star would be to base the diameter on the stripe, and a proportion of three fourths of the width of the stripe was suggested. However, the Commission felt that the proper diameter of the circle enclosing the star could be determined only by means of a drawing. For further consideration of the subject the Commission desire, therefore, the following three drawings submitted to them:

1. A drawing of a "standard flag" based on the proposed new proportions,
2. A union, with the star diameter 3/4 of the width of the stripe, that could be superimposed on the union of design No.1,
3. A drawing showing the 48 stars arranged on a diagonal, using a square union.

The Commission respectfully call attention to the fact that it is only since 48 stars have been shown that the geometric pattern has been used, and in this connection also call attention to the United States flag of July 4, 1818, in which the union is square.

The Commission felt that in making any change in the size of the union, the star should not be too small, nor too large to affect the blue of the union; also the question arose as to allowing space for additional stars to represent new States.

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Mr. R. M. Hudson, Chairman,
Flag Standardization Committee,
Division of Simplified Practice,
Department of Commerce,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT A.

C O P Y

December 17, 1923.

Dear Mr. Phillips:

In further reference to your letter of November 16, and to the communication of the Commission of Fine Arts addressed to you under date of November 21, 1923, concerning the International Art Exhibition at Venice, I am pleased to transmit to you herewith, at the request of this Commission made at their meeting on December 14th, a letter received from the National Academy of Design, setting forth favorable action taken by their Council in the matter.

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Hon. William Phillips,
Undersecretary of State,
Department of State.

EXHIBIT B.

C O P Y

December 18, 1923.

My dear Mr. Secretary:

The Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on December 14, 1923, received your letter as to the Dominican Campaign Medal, stating that the Navy Department is well pleased with the result of Mr. Weinman's efforts and have approved the photograph of the model "conditional, however, upon the removal from the face of the medal of the initials of the sculptor.

The Commission respectfully suggest that your requirement that the initials of the sculptor be removed from the medal be modified. It is the custom in all countries where a medal is regarded a work of art to have the initials of the sculptor placed thereon as a means of authenticating the work in time to come. The precedents for placing initials are now firmly established. Such initials are to be found on all the coins, including the silver coins now used by the United States; also on the Verdun medal, and on all other medallic work of the Government. Placing initials on coins and medals is not primarily for the benefit of the designer but for the public, and especially for that portion of the public that takes a deep interest in the development and progress of art in the United States.

Your request for photographs of the model will be brought to the attention of Mr. Weinman.

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

The Honorable

The Secretary of the Navy.

EXHIBIT C.

C O P Y

December 18, 1923.

Dear Mr. Tittman:

Your letter of December 12th, submitting further designs and a medallion proposed for the Henry B. F. Macfarland Memorial, received the attention of the Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting December 14, 1923.

The Commission cannot approve the revised scheme for the reason that the triangle at the intersection of 28th and M Streets already has one fountain good as to type and location. The space is too small to take a second fountain. The design of the proposed drinking fountain is hardly suited to a park. It is too memorial in character for park adornment. The Commission suggest that, if thought preferable, the medallion of Mr. Macfarland might be placed on Peck Chapel.

The model and the designs are herewith returned to you.

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Mr. Charles T. Tittman,
Chairman, Macfarland
Memorial Committee,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT D.

C O P Y

December 17, 1923.

Dear Mrs. Andrews:

Your letter of December 13, 1923, and the model which you submitted therewith, of a statue of Thomas Jefferson, proposed by The National Monticello Association for a location on the south steps of the State, War and Navy Building, received the attention of the Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting December 14, 1923.

The Commission of Fine Arts have not been informed of an Act of Congress authorizing the erection of the proposed statue of Thomas Jefferson, and until such time the Commission can take no official action in the matter. The model is therefore returned to you.

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Mrs. Minnigerode Andrews, President,
The National Monticello Association,
1232 Sixteenth Street,
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT E.

C O P Y

June 12, 1923.

Dear Sir:

Your letter of April 20, stating that Howard University has received an appropriation of $40,000 with which to lay out the preliminary sketches and plans for your Gymnasium, Armory, Athletic Field, etc., within a limited cost of $197,500, which has been authorized, has been brought to the attention of the Commission of Fine Arts. The Commission have noted that their advice is desired with reference to the improvement of the grounds of the University before proceeding with plans.

The matter has been brought to the particular attention of Mr. James L. Greenleaf, Landscape Architect member of the Commission, who after a personal inspection of the grounds, submitted the following recommendations, which the Commission of Fine Arts approve:

1. It is assumed that Vermont Avenue will be extended from the junction of 9th and Florida Avenue, N. W., directly to the entrance of the University at Georgia Avenue, where there should be a circle with radiating streets.

2. Northeastward from the circle a parkway should extend along Georgia Avenue, passing to the north of the Athletic Field (at about Harvard Street), into McMillan Park, and leading to the Soldiers Home. By the opening up of Vermont Avenue and the creation of this parkway there would be a new thoroughfare between the center of the city and the Soldiers Home.

3. The circle should have an architectural treatment, by which the main entrance to the University would lead off directly from the circle. There should be open park ground from the circle up the slope towards the campus.

4. At the corresponding diagonal there should be a similar architectural treatment, whereby a parkway would extend over into College Street, and so around into the parkways of McMillan Park.

5. The main approach to the grounds swings up the slope into the major axis of the campus, ending in a motor sweep, from which the border drive of the campus (now 6th Street) takes off to the right and to the left.

The major axis of the campus runs through, unbroken by buildings, to the terrace commanding McMillan Park and the region beyond. A great asset of the University grounds is this overlook, which should be developed as a broad grass avenue, with double rows of elms branching high. At the south it sweeps into the plateau before the president's house. At the north it sweeps into the general plateau at the northeast

corner of the campus. This overlook terrace, if strongly emphasized, will give high character to the grounds.

At the northeast corner for a moderate distance a high retaining wall is fundamental. This bit of retaining wall, while needful, will give a fine continuity to the landscape. This work if well carried out will never need to be changed. It belongs to the eternal things.

6. An important item is the placing of the gymnasium in relation to the Athletic Field. The Commission advise that the new gymnasium be built in relation to and on axis with the Athletic Field, and that adequate space be secured for the Athletic Field.

Howard University is ideally located; the institution has a national reputation and is the representative university of its kind. Little has been done for a systematic development of its location,-yet the grounds may be made one of the attractive features of Washington. These recommendations, if carried out, will bring the grounds into proper relation to the park system of Washington, and will produce results highly beneficial to the University.

The Commission urge that these fundamental arrangements be done rightly at the outset.

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Dr. Emmett J. Scott,
Secretary-Treasurer,
Howard University,
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT F.

C O P Y

December 18, 1923.

Dear Sir:

With reference to your letter of November 21, transmitting photographs of a bust of President Harding, concerning which Mr. Salvatore M. Pino, 42 Elm Street, New York City, desires an expression as to its artistic value, with a view to its being presented to the Government here in Washington, I have to inform you that these photographs received the attention of the Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting December 14, 1923.

The Commission regard the bust as not well executed nor yet a good likeness of the late President Harding.

The photographs are returned herewith.

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Lieut. Col. C. O. Sherrill,
Officer in Charge of
Public Buildings and Grounds.

EXHIBIT G.

COPY

December 19, 1923.

Sir:

The design for the completion of the monument to the Unknown Soldier, as shown in the photographic model erected in front of the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater, was inspected by the entire membership of the Commission of Fine Arts on December 14, 1923. Afterwards the design was discussed with you, and at your request this statement of the opinions of the members of the Commission is made to you:

The design has two elements, first, the shaft itself, and, second, the sculptural treatment of the ornamental feature at the top.

The location of the monument with relation to the Amphitheater and the city of Washington requires a monument of the general form submitted by Mr. Hastings. The character of the memorial as the Nation's tribute requires an importance as great as that attending the ceremonies at the burial of the Unknown Soldier. The nature of the site and the character of the monument have been met in the Hastings' design in a very distinguished manner.

The scale of the monument is right and it has an appropriate, majestic quality. The relation of the monument to the auditorium, the balustrade, the terrace, and the landscape, agrees with the best principles of art. The design is impressive in its mass and fine in its simple general form and proportions. The monument as designed is in harmony with the Amphitheater. It gives assurance of being in every way a notable work of art.

The sculptural feature as now shown in the model is merely a sketch to indicate the general treatment. It has not been modeled by a sculptor and is therefore subject to modification by way of obtaining simplicity and a larger degree of dignity. The proportions of the sculpture to the mass of the shaft is right. The sculpture itself should be simplified.

The Commission of Fine Arts unanimously and strongly approve of the location, the proportions and mass of the design submitted by Mr. Hastings. The Commission also unanimously approve a sculptural treatment in the general form indicated, subject to study and execution by a sculptor of the first rank.

For the Commission:

Very respectfully, yours,

The Honorable

The Secretary of War.

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

EXHIBIT H.

C O P Y

STATEMENT ACCOMPANYING THE REPORT MADE TO THE HONORABLE THE SECRETARY OF WAR BY THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS ON THE LOCATION AND DESIGN OF THE MONUMENT TO THE UNKNOWN SOLDIER.

In September 1921, the committee having in charge the burial of the Unknown Soldier and the building of an appropriate memorial, having determined upon a site either within or in close proximity with the Arlington Amphitheater, naturally and properly consulted Mr. Thomas Hastings, the architect of the Amphitheater, as to location and design. The committee had in mind a location on the main platform or rostrum of the auditorium. Mr. Hastings explained that a monument located on the terrace was originally contemplated in his design for the Amphitheater. Upon his recommendation this site was unanimously selected. Mr. Hastings described in a general way his idea of the memorial, and he was instructed to prepare a design for a monumental shaft and to prepare working drawings and obtain estimates for the foundations, plinth, and all the arrangements for receiving the body of the Unknown Soldier. The necessity of making immediate provision for burial, impelled the committee to order the base at once, leaving the design to further study while the plinth was being executed. The ceremonies were to take place on November 11, 1921.

Acting under these instructions, Mr. Hastings prepared a tentative design similar to the one now recommended. This design was presented to the committee and was approved in its preliminary form. In conformity with this design and as a portion of the entire structure, the present base was constructed. The design now submitted shows the completion of the design originally approved. The plinth and foundations as now built are unchanged from the original approved design. This original design embodied a sarcophagus on top of a high shaft.

The site having been fixed, the design should compose and be in scale with the general design of the Amphitheater and its architectural approaches. The dominating lines of the building are horizontal. So also are the lines of the distant view of the Potomac and the horizon. The lines of the terraces and balustrades are also horizontal. The vertical line of the monument in opposition to these horizontal lines and in the central axis of the composition is needed. This consideration was indicated in Mr. Hastings' original design for the Amphitheater. It was not then carried out for lack of money.

The monument should be large in scale and rich in outline and shadows, because it comes against an open and distant view. It should also command attention and make appeal to the higher emotions of the public.

This brings the second consideration. The Unknown Soldier stands for and typifies the entire legion who gave their lives for the freedom of the peace loving peoples of the World. France buried her Unknown Soldier under the greatest triumphal arch in the world, thereby giving a new meaning and significance to this splendid monument. Great Britain not only buried her Unknown Soldier in Westminster Abbey, surrounded by the great men of England's history, but she also erected a most imposing cenotaph, somewhat similar

to though larger and higher than the one we contemplate. The British cenotaph is located in the crowded section of London.

Our memorial should be an adequate and artistic effort in a new direction. It should be unlike any one of the thousands of monuments already included in the confines of Arlington Cemetery. It should be distinguished, original, filled with imagination, to indicate the spirit of its high purpose. It should be looked up to and not down upon when approached from the steps of the Amphitheater. It should rise to dominate the uninterrupted flat and distant view of the Potomac, which strongly demands a first plane, or foreground, to the picture.

The design admirably fulfills this dual purpose in the solution of a very difficult and technical problem in art. The location is appropriate. The general form is correct. The architect has done his part of the work. All that remains is the handling of the sculpture by a sculptor competent to execute his part within the general architectural lines laid down.